

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/964,060	BAERLOCHER, ANTHONY
Examiner	Art Unit	
Aaron L Enatsky	3713	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aaron L Enatsky

(3) George H. Gerstman

(2) Michael O'Neill

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 June 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,089,976 to Schneider et al., US 6,309,300 to Glavich and GB 2,144,644 to Barrie. and US 6,015,346 to Bennett

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an AUE
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed proposed amendments to independent claims including adding the features of random award assignment to player selected values and showing pay values in a separate area. Applicant also disclosed that prior art reference to Glavich were assigned to IGT and therefore not applicable as prior art. With regard to random award assignment, Examiner stated that the particulars of that feature are found in the prior art of record. With regard to the feature of showing pay values in a separate display area, the separate display feature is not found in the prior art of record upon initial inspection, however as broadly claimed probably would not read over that which is known in the gaming arts. Additionally, subject matter covered by the Glavich patent also exists in other prior art of record.